IN THE UNITED STATES	DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT O	F MARYLAND
(NORTHERN DIV	ISION)
(x
EARLE E. AUSHERMAN, et al.,	x Civil Action N
Plaintiffs	x MJG-01-CV-438
v.	х
BANK OF AMERICA CORPORATION,	* ORIGINAL
et al.,	x
Defendants	X
	x
TELEPHONIC HEARING ON OPEN	DISCOVERY MOTIONS
Baltimore, Ma	ryland
Monday, February	4, 2002
2:00 P.M	•
BEFORE: THE HONORABLE	PAUL W. GRIMM
Job No. 10660-9	
Pages 1 - 19	



L.A.D. REPORTING COMPANY, INC.

1100 Connecticut Avenue, NW • Suite 1150, Washington, D.C. 20036 • 202.861.3410
Fax: 202.861.3425 • 800.292.4789 • Website: ladreporting.com • E-mail: lisa@ladreporting.com

plaintiffs they will be deposed in Baltimore subject to the following limitations. The depositions will not exceed two hours in length, which the defendants agreed on their own, which was a reasonable limitation on the length. This assumes of course that the answers to the questions will be responsive and nonevasive, as is required by Rule 37 A 3. And those depositions, if I remember correctly, the Rule 33 interrogatory responses are due today, so hopefully the defendants will not need the entire two-hour period of time because they will have the substance, no doubt, of their claims and their damages in the interrogatory answers as well. So two

As to the remaining plaintiffs who reside more than 100 miles away, I will permit their depositions to be taken, but they will be taken by telephone or by remote electronic transmission so that they do not actually have to come to this area in order to have their depositions taken. Those depositions also will be limited to two hours in

hours is the outside limit provided the answers are

responsive and nonevasive.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

11

April cutoff coming up, you both have an interest in getting the information that need to proceed forward, so work that out. I would think that you would be able to resolve any scheduling issues within that time. If there's a problem, then counsel can let me know.

Obviously any deposition questions of the telephone depositions would have to require coordination of documents in advance so that that can be done efficiently, and we can go from there. I am persuaded that even though Mr. Sweetland has proffered that the plaintiffs would say that they don't know how their names came about to be selected for their credit reports being ordered, the defendants' primary point which persuaded me to exceed the 25 limit was the fact that each plaintiff might have different damages. And while damages can be obtained through interrogatory answers, they are typically not as efficient in that regard as deposition testimony. So I am persuaded on balance that by allowing the 25 depositions as requested, not requiring face-to-face depositions for the remote